

Applicant: Pritchard et al.
Application No.: 10/666,471

Group II: claims 37-46, drawn to a flexible bag, classified in class 383, subclass 103.

Applicants respectfully traverse this restriction requirement. However, in order to advance prosecution of the Application, Applicants elect the invention of Group I for prosecution on the merits, corresponding to claims 1-36 and 47-67.

A restriction requirement based on distinction is proper if the inventions are distinct and a serious burden on the Examiner exists in examining the application. Applicants respectfully submit that no serious burden exists in examining all of the claims in the application. The claims of Group I and Group II, as grouped by the Examiner, are so inter-related as to require a same field of search. As such, examination of all of the pending claims together would be more efficient than separating the claims for examination in different applications.


If for any reason the Examiner believes that an interview, either telephonically or in person, would advance prosecution of the application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange an interview.

Applicant: Pritchard et al.
Application No.: 10/666,471

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Pritchard et al.

By 
Ryan W. O'Donnell
Registration No. 53,401

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400

RWO/vs